

CHAPTER 14
CULTURAL RESOURCES



14.0 CULTURAL RESOURCES

14.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

14.1.1 Cultural Setting

The Lincoln/Penryn vicinity is within the ethnographic territory of the Nisenan, one of three Maiduan speaking tribelets inhabiting the north-eastern half of the Sacramento Valley and the adjoining western slopes of the Sierra Nevada. Also known as the Southern Maidu, the Nisenan inhabited a named village, Bamuma, near present day Lincoln (Wilson and Towne, 1978: Figure 1).

The Nisenan made their home along tributaries and drainages of the American, Yuba, and Bear Rivers and the lower reaches of the Feather River. Permanent settlements were often located on low rises near larger streams, with seasonal encampments located along smaller drainages. The Nisenan village of Bamuma reportedly contained a dance house in addition to more typical structures such as brush shelters, sweat houses, and acorn granaries (Wilson and Towne, 1978).

Initial Euro-American use of the Lincoln/Penryn vicinity did not occur until after the discovery of gold near Colma in 1848. Although Spanish missionaries and later American trappers entered the general region, no accounts of visits to the Lincoln/Penryn vicinity are known. With the Gold Rush, however, the region became heavily populated with prospectors, entrepreneurs, and others seeking their fortune in the goldfields. The present day communities of Loomis, Newcastle, and Penryn arose from mining camps that were established during the mid-1850s. During the ensuing decades many became disenchanted with the search for gold and turned to other means of making a living. In the Lincoln/Penryn vicinity, granite quarrying and various agricultural practices (e.g., cattle ranching, fruit orchards) became common economic pursuits (Windmiller et al., 1998a, 1998b).

14.1.2 Paleontological Setting

Paleontological resources are tied directly to the geologic units of the study area. Rather than reiterate the geologic history of the project area and surrounding region, however, the reader is referred to Chapter 10 of this Draft EIR. Of the geologic units underlying Bickford Ranch, the Mehrten lahars (volcanic mudflows) overlying the conglomerates of the Mehrten Formation has the potential for containing paleontological resources.

Within the Rocklin/Roseville vicinity, “fossil plants have been recovered from Mehrten lahars, particularly several miles to the south of the property along Sierra College Blvd.” (Noble, 1997:5). Although vertebrate remains have been recovered from Mehrten lahars in other vicinities, none have been identified in Placer County (Noble, 1997:5, 8).

14.1.3 Technical Studies

The initial cultural resources inventory for the Bickford Ranch site was completed by Peak & Associates (1995) and resulted in the identification of 50 cultural resources. One recorded site, DCN-05, consists of an accumulation of modern trash and thus does not meet age-criteria for recordation as a historic resource. The remaining 49 cultural resources include midden deposits with stationary milling stations, “isolated” stationary milling stations, historic ditches, segments of two historic though currently active canals (Caperton and Antelope), rock alignments (walls and/or fencelines), small mines/mine tailings, homestead/cabin sites, remnants of a cattle chute, a work camp, a ranch complex, a mining complex, and granite quarries. In several instances, resources exhibit both prehistoric and historic constituents. In

addition to identifying and recording these cultural resources, Peak & Associates (1995) placed a series of shovel tests at two sites (BR-01 and BR-08) in an attempt to characterize the cultural deposits.

The cultural resources within Bickford Ranch were recently revisited by Windmiller and colleagues (1998a). This investigation involved the relocation and evaluation of the 50 resources identified by Peak & Associates (1995). The evaluation was conducted to determine which sites were important resources in compliance with CEQA. All but two of the 50 sites (BR-07 and DCN-27) were relocated and subsequently evaluated.

Shovel test units were placed within seven sites where “archival research and surface evidence were not sufficient to complete the evaluations” (Windmiller et al., 1998a:18) (Sites BR-05, DCN-12, DCN-17, DCN-22, DCN-23, DCN-25, and DCN-29). Additional shovel test units were placed within the boundaries of site BR-08 to “fill a perceived gap in the Peak & Associates study at that site” (Windmiller et al., 1998a:18).

As part of both the Peak & Associates (1995) and Windmiller et al. (1998a) investigations, consultations were initiated with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), various individuals identified by the NAHC, Placer County Department of Museums, and the Placer County Historical Society. These consultations were taken into account during the Windmiller et al. (1998a) evaluation of the Bickford Ranch cultural resources. A description of these consultations can be found in the initial Windmiller et al. technical report (1998a). Based on the results of this investigation, Windmiller and his colleagues determined that nine of the 50 cultural resources located within the Bickford Ranch project area were important under CEQA.

A follow-up report (Windmiller et al., 1998b) was produced in anticipation of project compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as part of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 permitting process. The nine sites determined to be important resources under CEQA were likewise found to be significant (i.e., National Register eligible) under Section 106. This second report (Windmiller et al., 1998b) has not been submitted for Federal review.

Subsequent to the Peak & Associates (1995) and Windmiller et al. (1998a, 1998b) investigations, additional lands were added to the proposed project area. These included two potential corridors for an off-site water line and an off-site sewer line, respectively.

As the proposed sewer alignment is situated along a section of SR 193 that had been previously inventoried for cultural resources (Offermann, 1992), no additional investigation was necessary. The two alternative waterline alignments, however, required a cultural resources inventory. On 19 November 1998, the potential waterline corridors were subjected to an archaeological pedestrian reconnaissance by Dames & Moore. These previously unsurveyed areas were visually inspected utilizing 20 meter parallel transects. In areas where vegetation obscured the ground surface, 20 cm × 20 cm patches were occasionally cleared using hand tools or footwear to increase ground visibility. No additional cultural resources were identified as a result of this reconnaissance.

In addition to these cultural resource investigations, a paleontological assessment of the Bickford Ranch was completed (Noble, 1997). A series of transects were walked across the project area in an attempt to identify paleontological resources and/or those geological units known to contain paleontological resources. No paleontological remains were identified; however, Mehrten lahars were observed and these do have a slight potential for containing paleontological resources (Noble, 1997).

14.1.4 Important Cultural Resources

The following discussion describes known or potentially important cultural resources on the proposed project site. Nine resources were deemed important by Windmiller and his colleagues (1998a). Those nine important cultural resources situated within the construction footprint of the currently proposed project were visited by Dames & Moore as a means to verify their location in relation to specific project plans. In addition, 17 archaeological sites comprised of “isolated” milling features are also described below because of their potentially important cultural resource status.

BR-01. Situated within the M-1 portion of the Bickford Ranch project area, this prehistoric campsite exhibits two stationary milling features each with a single mortar cup and a subsurface deposit consisting of lithic tools and debitage. Limited testing of the site by Peak & Associates (1995) indicates that the deposit extends to approximately 50 cm below the current ground surface.

BR-05. This multi-component site is situated within an oak grove located within the proposed equestrian area of the Bickford Ranch development. Although comprised primarily of two stationary milling features containing a total of six individual mortar cups, site BR-05 also contains a historic component characterized by a low cobble wall and remnants of a ditch. Subsurface examination conducted by Windmiller et al. (1998a) revealed a 30 to 40 cm deep prehistoric midden containing fire-fractured rock and charcoal centered around one of the milling features (Feature A).

BR-08. Tested by both Peak & Associates (1995) and Windmiller et al. (1998a), this prehistoric campsite is located along the edge of an open meadow in the M-2 area of Bickford Ranch. Although containing only a single stationary milling feature, 11 individual mortar cups occurred on this feature making it “one of the largest” concentrations on Bickford Ranch (Windmiller et al., 1998a:20). A midden deposit averaging 60 cm in depth and containing fire-fractured rock, charcoal, and minor amounts of lithic debitage was identified near the milling feature.

DCN-12. This multi-component site is located within an area to be developed into the golf course. The prehistoric component is comprised of six stationary milling features containing a total of 20 mortar cups and a midden deposit of various depths (10 - 42 cm) that contains lithic tools and debitage, fire-fractured rock, faunal remains, and charcoal. The historic component contains a possible collapsed adit/powder magazine, an earthen dam, a collection of cobbles, a possible cooking area containing charcoal and various artifacts, and evidence of granite quarrying.

DCN-16. Site DCN-16 is comprised of three stationary milling features, with an associated cultural deposit. Only one of the site’s milling features is located within the confines of Bickford Ranch. This feature, situated within the proposed the golf course, exhibits four individual mortar cups. Since the remaining two features are outside of the project area their particular characteristics are unknown.

DCN-17. Like site DCN-16, this site is currently situated within the confines of the proposed golf course. As recorded by Peak & Associates (1995), DCN-17 consists of an historic period homestead exhibiting a square cellar, partially rock-lined well, and a 4 × 5-foot deep pit of unknown origin. Test excavations conducted by Windmiller et al. (1998a) recovered faunal remains exhibiting evidence of historic butchering, cut nails, two complete bottles, shards of hard-white improved earthenware, and glass fragments. Of particular interest was the prehistoric component revealed during this investigation. From within their shovel tests, the Windmiller team recovered a portable mortar, a milling slab (i.e., metate), projectile point fragments, lithic debitage, and red ochre. These materials were recovered from a midden deposit that contained fire-fractured rock and charcoal.

DCN-23. Situated within the proposed golf course immediately southwest of site DCN-12, this historic period site appears to be a work camp, possibly associated with the construction of Clark Tunnel. Features observed at the site include a dry-laid stone foundation, a rock-lined well or privy pit, and a concentration of various metal artifacts. The wide variety of metal artifacts, including many that appear to be hand forged, suggests that this particular locale within the site may have been utilized by a blacksmith. Test excavations recovered artifacts consistent with the 1910 date for construction of Clark Tunnel (Windmiller et al., 1998a).

DCN-25. Encompassing an area of nearly 13,000 square meters, site DCN-25 is among the largest sites in the Bickford Ranch Specific Plan Project area. In part due to its extent, the site occurs within two development areas. The northern third of the site is within the proposed golf course, while the remaining two-thirds is within the R-19 development area. The site contains a prehistoric component comprised of five stationary milling features with a combined total of eight mortar cups and a historic component, which is not eligible for listing to the CRHR, consisting of tailings, a prospecting pit, and various metal artifacts. Test excavations undertaken by Windmiller et al. (1998a) revealed the presence of three small but intact midden deposits, while the historic component is indicative of mining activity.

DCN-29. This historic homestead is situated within a Natural Open Space Easement. Consisting of a rock foundation, cellar, and introduced (i.e., non-native) vegetation, the site was found to date to post-1890 contexts by the Windmiller team (1998a).

Isolated Milling Stations. Based on their apparent lack of a cultural deposit, Windmiller et al. (1998a) concluded that 17 archaeological sites comprised of “isolated” milling features did not qualify as important resources under CEQA. This conclusion was based on surface examination only, as no subsurface testing was conducted. In some locations vegetation obscured the ground surface, and in two instances (BR-07 and DCN-27) the sites could not be relocated at all. Recent work in the northern Sierra and adjoining foothills (Nilsson et al., in preparation; Nilsson et al., 1994) have revealed that often these seemingly “isolated” features contain subsurface deposits, some of them substantial in nature. Thus it is possible that any of the “isolated” milling feature sites (i.e., BR-02, BR-04, BR-06, BR-07, BR-10, BR-12, BR-13, DCN-07, DCN-10, DCN-13, DCN-15, DCN-18, DCN-21, DCN-26, DCN-27, DCN-32, and DCN-33) may in fact have deposits that are currently undetectable from the surface.

14.2 REGULATORY SETTING

Cultural resources are defined as buildings, sites, structures, or objects, each of which may have historical, architectural, archaeological, cultural, and/or scientific importance. Numerous laws, regulations, and statutes on both the federal and State levels seek to protect and target the management of cultural resources. These include the: Antiquities Act of 1906; Historic Sites Act of 1935; Reservoir Salvage Act of 1960; National Historic Preservation Act of 1966; National Environmental Policy Act of 1969; Executive Order 11593 (Projection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment, 5/13/1971); 36 CFR 800 and CFR 60 (Advisory Council on Historic Preservation: Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties, Amendments to Existing Regulations, 1/30/1979, National Register of Historic Places, Nominations by States and Federal Agencies, Rules and Regulations, 1/9/1976); Revisions to 36 CFR 800 (Protection of Historic Properties, 1/10/1986); Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act of 1974; American Indian Religious Freedom Joint Resolution of 1978; Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979; Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990; and the California Environmental Quality Act. Collectively these regulations and guidelines establish a comprehensive program for the identification, evaluation, and treatment of cultural resources.

CEQA requires that public or private projects financed or approved by the State must assess the effects of the project upon cultural resources. CEQA requires that if project implementation results in significant

effects to important cultural resources, then alternative plans and/or mitigation measures must be considered. However, only “important” cultural resources need to be addressed. Under CEQA, important cultural resources are those that are either listed or eligible to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP); listed or eligible to be listed on the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR); registered or eligible to be registered as a State Historical Landmark; or included in any responsible local inventory of historic properties.

As of January 1, 1998 for a cultural resource to be deemed “important” under CEQA and thus eligible for listing to the CRHR, it must meet at least one of the following criteria:

- (a) the resource is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California History and cultural heritage;
- (b) the resource is associated with the lives of persons important to our past;
- (c) the resource embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic value; or,
- (d) the resource has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

In addition to cultural resources as recognized by Section 106 of the NRHP and CEQA (e.g., archaeological sites, historic structures), Placer County’s General Plan contains policies governing development within Placer County. The policies relating to cultural resources are identified in the General Plan Consistency discussion in Section 14.3.

14.3 IMPACTS

This section identifies and discusses the environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project, and suggests mitigation measures to reduce the levels of impact. A detailed discussion of mitigation measures is included in Section 14.4.

Potential significant impacts associated with cultural resources have been evaluated using the following criteria:

- the proposed project would result in damage to important cultural resources;
- the proposed project would result in damage to potentially important cultural resources (i.e., unevaluated milling feature sites); and,
- the proposed project would result in damage to previously undiscovered cultural resources.

Under CEQA only those cultural resources deemed important (e.g., CRHR- or NRHP-eligible) can be significantly affected (i.e., impacted) with project implementation. As discussed previously, nine of the 50 cultural resources identified within the project site have been recommended as important resources (Windmiller et al., 1998a). Also, the “isolated” milling stations within the project site may in fact retain undetected deposits. If such deposits are present, these sites could represent important resources warranting further consideration.

14.3.1 Construction Impacts

As archaeological sites are generally only physically affected (Caltrans 1991: 5-2), only impacts resulting from project-related construction are discussed.

All important cultural resources within the project site save DCN-29 are located in areas slated for development (i.e., residential units, golf course, and equestrian area). Therefore all of these sites with the exception of DCN-29 would be affected by the proposed project. Of the 17 “isolated” milling stations, only three of five potentially important sites (BR-4, BR-7, BR-10, DCN-32, and DCN-33) occur within Natural Open Space. The remaining 12 could be affected by proposed project implementation.

IMPACT C-1:	Damage to important cultural resources during construction
SIGNIFICANCE:	Potentially Significant
MITIGATION:	
Proposed:	Mitigation Measures C-A (Incorporate important cultural resources into open space); C-B (Cap resource area with layer of soil prior to construction); and C-C (Conduct data recovery excavation if capping is infeasible)
Recommended:	None
RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANCE:	Less Than Significant

Ground disturbing activities associated with proposed project construction occurring within or immediately adjacent to an important cultural site would potentially damage the resource. This would be a potentially significant project impact.

Implementation of any one of the three identified mitigation measures would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level.



IMPACT C-2:	Damage to potentially important cultural resources during construction
SIGNIFICANCE:	Potentially Significant
MITIGATION:	
Proposed:	Mitigation Measure C-A (Incorporate important cultural resources into open space); <i>or</i> C-D (Conduct subsurface testing) if ground disturbing activities are to occur within 100 feet of unevaluated resource. If subsurface deposits are encountered and the resource is determined to be important and Mitigation measure C-A remains infeasible, then Measure C-B (Cap resource area with layer of soil prior to construction) or C-C (Conduct data recovery excavation if capping is infeasible) would be necessary.
Recommended:	None
RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANCE:	Less Than Significant

Ground-disturbing activities associated with the proposed project within the vicinity of unevaluated “isolated” milling sites could damage potentially important cultural resources. This would be a potentially significant impact of the proposed project.

Implementation of any of the proposed mitigation measures would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level.



IMPACT C-3:

Damage to cultural resources including archaeological artifacts, exotic rock (non-native), or unusual amounts of shell or bone if inadvertently exposed during construction

SIGNIFICANCE:

Potentially Significant

MITIGATION:**Proposed:**

Mitigation Measure C-E: (Immediately stop ground disturbing activities in vicinity and consult qualified professional archaeologist, the Placer County Planning Department, Department of Museums, and the County Coroner if buried cultural deposits are discovered during construction. The County Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission if it is determined that the remains are Native American. Construction crews will be trained in the identification of archaeological resources prior to commencing ground-disturbing activities. This training will include: (1) proper identification of archaeological deposits; (2) the procedures to be followed in the event of such a discovery; (3) an understanding of the importance of protecting cultural resources; and (4) an overview of applicable laws, statutes and ordinances. Training will be conducted by a qualified archaeologist in person, and written materials will be provided to each trained crew member, who will be required to sign that he or she has received the training, understands it, and agrees to abide by it.)

Recommended:

None

RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANCE:

Less Than Significant

During construction of the proposed project, previously undiscovered cultural resources could be inadvertently exposed during grading or excavation activities. This would be a potentially significant impact of the proposed project.

This potential impact would be mitigated to a less than significant level by halting ground disturbing activities temporarily until a qualified professional archaeologist, the Placer County Planning Department, and Department of Museums are consulted. If the discovery includes human remains then the Placer County Coroner and native American Heritage Commission must also be contacted. Work in the area may only proceed after authorization is granted by the Placer County Planning Department.

**IMPACT C-4:**

Damage to paleontological resources inadvertently exposed during construction

SIGNIFICANCE:

Potentially Significant

MITIGATION:**Proposed:**

Mitigation Measure C-F (Retain a qualified professional paleontologist to conduct weekly inspections during grading activities and salvage fossils as necessary)

Recommended:

None

RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANCE:

Less Than Significant

During construction of the proposed project, previously undiscovered paleontological resources could be exposed through grading or excavation activities. This would be a potentially significant impact of the proposed project.

This potential impact would be mitigated to a less than significant level by having a qualified professional paleontologist conduct weekly inspections to identify, evaluate, and properly manage potentially exposed resources during grading activities. The applicant shall provide written evidence to the Placer County Planning Department that a qualified paleontologist has been retained to provide the required services.

14.3.2 General Plan Consistency

The Placer County General Plan policies addressing cultural resources are identified below, and a determination of the proposed project's consistency is made. The proposed project is consistent with Placer County's cultural resources policies.

- 5.D.6 The County shall require that discretionary development projects identify and protect from damage, destruction, and abuse, important historical, archaeological, paleontological, and cultural sites and their contributing environment. Such assessments shall be incorporated into a countywide cultural resource data base, to be maintained by the Department of Museums.

Consistent.

A cultural resource survey of the project site has been conducted. Identified resources will be included within open space areas or within protective easements.

- 5.D.7 The County shall require that discretionary development projects are designed to avoid potential impacts to significant paleontological or cultural resources whenever possible. Unavoidable impacts, whenever possible, shall be reduced to a less than significant level and/or shall be mitigated by extracting maximum recoverable data. Determinations of impacts, significance, and mitigation shall be made by qualified archaeological (in consultation with recognized local Native American groups), historical, or paleontological consultants, depending on the type of resource in question.

Consistent.

As stated above protective measures for identified cultural resources have been incorporated into the proposed project. In addition, recommendations include the presence of an archaeologist and paleontologist on the project site during project construction to prevent inadvertent damage to known or potential resources.

14.4 MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure C-A: Incorporate important cultural resources into open space

Mitigation Measure C-A applies to Impacts C-1 and C-2.

The Applicant proposes to incorporate important cultural resources into open space to the extent possible. Easement restrictions would then be incorporated in CC&Rs as necessary. CEQA stipulates that in-situ preservation is the preferred manner of avoiding damage to archaeological resources. By incorporating important cultural resources into open spaces or greenbelt, impacts to these resources would be avoided.

Mitigation Measure C-B: Cap resource area with layer of soil prior to construction

Mitigation Measure C-B applies to Impacts C-1 and C-2.

The Applicant proposes to cap important and potentially important archeological resources where feasible prior to construction in the area. An acceptable process of “capping” archaeological resources with soil must include the following elements:

- the soils to be covered must not suffer serious compaction;
- the covering materials must not be chemically active;
- the site must be one in which the natural process of deterioration have been arrested; and,
- the site must have been recorded, including the areal extent of subsurface deposits.

Mitigation Measure C-C: Conduct data recovery excavation if capping is infeasible

Mitigation Measure C-C applies to Impacts C-1 and C-2.

Require the project Applicant to retain a qualified professional archeologist to conduct data recovery excavation. This mitigation measure would be implemented as an alternative to Mitigation Measures C-A or C-B at identified important or potentially important cultural resource sites.

In compliance with CEQA, implementation of this mitigation measure would entail preparation and adoption of a data recovery plan that makes provisions for adequately recovering the scientifically consequential information from and about the resource. The data recovery plan must be prepared and adopted prior to commencing any excavation activities.

Mitigation Measure C-D: Conduct subsurface testing

Mitigation Measure C-D applies to Impact C-2.

Require the project Applicant to retain a qualified professional archeologist to conduct subsurface testing at potentially important cultural resource sites. As it has not been definitively determined that the 17 sites comprised of “isolated” milling stations do not contain subsurface deposits, subsurface testing procedures should be initiated for sites when construction is to occur within 100 feet and where Mitigation Measures C-A and C-B prove infeasible.

Subsurface testing procedures could involve shovel testing, augering, or other such techniques designed to identify and/or characterize subsurface cultural deposits. If a resource is determined to be important under CEQA, then Mitigation Measure C-C (Conduct data recovery excavation) must also be implemented.

Mitigation Measure C-E: Immediately stop ground disturbing activities in vicinity and consult qualified professional archaeologist, the Placer County Planning Department, the Department of Museums, and the County Coroner, if buried cultural deposits are discovered during construction. The County Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission if it is determined that the remains are Native American Indian.

Mitigation Measure C-E applies to Impact C-3.

In the event of the discovery of buried archaeological artifacts, exotic rock (non-native), or unusual amounts of shell or bone it is recommended that project activities in the vicinity of the find be immediately stopped and a qualified professional archaeologist consulted to assess the resource and provide proper management recommendations. In addition the Placer County Planning Department and

Department of Museums must also be contacted. Such recommendations for important resources could include resource avoidance (Mitigation Measure C-A), capping (Mitigation Measure C-B), or data recovery excavations (Mitigation Measure C-C). Work in the area may only proceed after authorization is granted by the Placer County Planning Department.

Construction crews will be trained in the identification of archaeological resources prior to commencing ground-disturbing activities. This training will include: (1) proper identification of archaeological deposits; (2) the procedures to be followed in the event of such a discovery; (3) an understanding of the importance of protecting cultural resources; and (4) an overview of applicable laws, statutes and ordinances. Training will be conducted by a qualified archaeologist in person, and written materials will be provided to each trained crew member, who will be required to sign that he or she has received the training, understands it, and agrees to abide by it.

Mitigation Measure C-F: Retain a qualified professional paleontologist to conduct weekly inspections during grading activities and salvage fossils as necessary

Mitigation Measure C-F applies to Impact C-4.

Placer County requires that the Applicant retain a professional paleontologist to implement a plan for managing paleontological resources, monitor grading activities, and salvage fossils as necessary. A paleontological report produced for the Proposed Project (Noble, 1997) recommends that given the low probability of encountering paleontological resources on the Bickford ranch, weekly inspections by a qualified professional paleontologist during grading activities shall be sufficient to manage these unique resources. The Applicant shall, however, provide written evidence to the Placer County Planning Department that a qualified paleontologist has been retained to provide the required services.